[5th August 1932

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether the allegations have been found to be well-founded?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"The report about the allegations is being considered, Sir."

Electricity

Estimate for supplying electric lights to Mettupalaiyam and Karamadai.

* 144 *Q.*—Mr. A. B. SHETTY: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the cost of supplying electric lights to Mettupalaiyam and Karamadai in Coimbatore district has been estimated;

(*b*) whether the works have been given on contract to anybody and if so, to whom; and

(*c*) whether tenders had been called for and if not, what the reasons are for such a procedure?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Part of the work amounting to Rs. 56,000 has been given on contract to the General Electric Company who are also contractors for the Coimbatore Distribution Works.

(*c*) No. This was considered as a supplementary work to the main work in and round Coimbatore and the economical procedure in such cases is to give the work to the main contractors at contract rates less a percentage rebate to make up for their savings in overhead charges. This has been done in this case.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—"May I know whether it is not a fact that in the case of the Coimbatore Distribution Works, the cost is met by the municipality, whereas in the case of Mettupalaiyam and Karamadai, the cost is borne by the Government?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"My hon. Friend's information is not correct. The Government do the work within the municipal limits as the agents of the municipality."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"With reference to the answer to clause (*c*), may I ask what the Government means when saying that the work in Mettupalaiyam and Karamadi is supplementary?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"The main works are in Coimbatore, and Mettupalaiyam and Karamadai are connected with that main work."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"Am I to understand that it is part of the same scheme?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Only the main work is in the Coimbatore town and the other work is in a rural area."

5th August 1932]

Mr. A. B. SHETTY:—" May I know whether the procedure adopted in this case is not opposed to the rules regarding the calling of tenders?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" The general rule is that tenders must be called for. In this particular case, it is in the interests of everybody that it was given to the principal contractor."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" Was it given with the previous consent of the Government, or was the matter subsequently ratified by the Government?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" The Government subsequently ratified the Chief Engineer's action. He has discretion in the matter."

Law and Order—General

Alleged beating of certain picketers in Bezwada on 10th June 1932.

* 145 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that on 10th June 1932 Mr. Challaswami Narayanamurthi and Surapaneni Gopalakrishnayya picketed the foreign cloth shop of Manikondu Narasimham and Majeti Subbayya in Bezwada;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that in spite of the Government Order, dated 15th January 1932, complaints have been received by Government of individual picketers who are less than five in number being beaten by the police; and

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the picketers referred to in (*a*) were subsequently admitted into the Peoples' Hospital for treatment; if so, whether the hon. the Home Member will be pleased to call for a statement from the Medical Officer in charge of the hospital showing the number and nature of injuries received and place the same on the table of the House?

A.—(*a*) Challaswami Narayanamurthi, Surapaneni Gopalakrishnayya and three others picketed the foreign cloth shops in the bazaar in Bezwada on 10th June 1932.

(*b*) Allegations have been made in some instances and have been investigated.

(*c*) The Government have no information, but will enquire.

Lathi charges in Bezwada between 6th January 1932 to 4th July 1932.

* 146 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) how many lathi charges or cane charges have there been in Bezwada from 6th January 1932 to 4th July 1932;

(*b*) what the number of persons injured in each charge is and what the nature of their injuries is; and